

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
HIGHER EDUCATION
and
ENERGY COMMITTEE
of the
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Economic Development, Higher Education & Energy Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Wednesday, **August 17, 2005**.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Lynne Nowick • Chairperson

Legislator Angie Carpenter • Vice•Chair

Legislator Jay Schneiderman

Legislator Cameron Alden

Legislator Foley

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Legislator Jon Cooper • Excused Absence

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Mea Knapp • Counsel to the Legislature

Joe Schroeder • Budget Review Office

Joe Muncey • Budget Review Office

Ilona Julius • Deputy Clerk of the Legislature

Ben Zwirn • County Executive's Office

Carolyn Fahey • Economic Development

Charles Stein • Suffolk Community College

George Gatta • Suffolk Community College
Fran Seims • Aide to Presiding Officer Caracappa
Jim Morgo • Commissioner Economic Development
Kathleen Cameron • Sayville Chamber of Commerce
All other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Lucia Braaten • Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Donna Catalano • Court Stenographer.

(* THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:15 A.M.*)

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I'd like to bring the meeting of Economic Development, Higher Education and Energy to order.
I'd like to start with a Salute to the Flag led by Legislator Alden.

SALUTATION

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Good morning, everybody. We do not have any presentations today, but I know that Mr. Morgo has a quick comment to make here and there, so if you'd like to come up.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Good morning, Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Committee, I actually have three succinct comments to make on three different pieces of legislation, two tabled, and one that's being introduced today.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Succinct is really good.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Okay. I'm going to be as succinct as I can be, depends on if you have questions for me or not. I want to talk about, first of all, tabled Resolution 1360, that would make the Airport Lease Screening Committee an advisory committee, and the ultimate determination on the leases at the airport would be where it should be, with you.

I talked two weeks about Resolution 1722, which does the same thing, but it's a different committee from the Lease Screening Committee, and, in fact, it includes a Gabreski leaseholder, three pilots who are users of the airport, and two fixed-base operators, also at the airport. And this would seem to be rife with a potential for conflicts, either if a potential leasee was a friend or a competitor, and there would be real problems in the recommendations.

I understand why they were placed on the committee in Resolution 1722, because that committee also talks about quality of life issues and uses of the airport and economic reasons at the airport. So it made sense for putting them on for those reasons. But as I said, two weeks ago, 1722 tries to do too much. It's an advisory committee for the leases, and it also is a committee to try to make the airport and continue it to be a good neighbor. So 1360 has a limited scope, and I think you'll agree that legislation that's focused and limited usually is better legislation. So I urge you to approve 1360. And that's all I have to say about 1360.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

All right.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Then I also want to talk about tabled Resolution 1714, which, again, I spoke about two weeks ago, and that is the resolution that would significantly change the function of the Citizens Downtown Revitalization Advisory Panel.

Two weeks ago, I mentioned the presentation in June of five representatives of that panel, and I think we all agree that we were impressed by their dedication and their conscientiousness and their task. Well, we had a meeting this last Monday night, this past Monday, the 15th, and it was mentioned there that now, because they went out on a limb and said they want to judge the applications based on merit and not on some kind of entitlement and politics as usual, that they have more of a responsibility. They have to really evaluate the applications that come. And I said, you know, you really •• now you've made this decision that you want to make your

recommendations to the Legislature based on the quality of the applications, now you have to do a systematic analytical approach to those applications.

They asked to for them, all of the applications, as soon as we get them in. The deadline is September 30th, but we think we'll be getting more in before that. And they are taking this responsibility very seriously. You know, one of the members of the panel said to me on the way out on Monday night, he said if this is changed, it really would be a slap in our face, that we want to do something as dedicated volunteers, we want to put a process that's objective based on definite criteria, and 1714 would take it away from us.

I know when I was considering whether I wanted to take this job or not, I had a conversation with Legislator Carpenter, and one of the things we talked about was the importance of the Downtown Revitalization Committee. And having known almost nothing about it before I came to work with the County last September, I can tell you that the dedication of these folks, these citizen volunteers, is really outstanding. So, I urge you to table 1714 again. And, finally, if there are no questions on 1714?

LEG. ALDEN:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Yeah, certainly, Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Jim, I don't mean to, and I'm not going to start an argument with you, but I think that's a mischaracterization of what the difference is of opinion. We've always thought, and we've always wanted that panel, and they are volunteers and they are doing a great job. I thought they were doing this, I thought they were evaluating each one of the projects on its merits. I didn't think there was any politics involved or anything like that. I think what we want to go to and Legislator Montano is going to here is back towards where each Legislator would end up with something in his district, similar to what Mr. Levy did by putting in those five separate grants that are outside of the economic •• downtown economic development or downtown revitalization. So I think that, you know •• I think we're on the same page, and I hope we are, because that's what I've been getting at over the last couple of meetings. It's just that you and

some other people would like to see, like, a lot of money in one or two significant type of projects, I agree with that, but I also think there's a lot of these little things that help out the downtowns and make it a more friendly environment and a more attractive environment to bring people in.

I think we can accomplish both. But here's the sticky point. You can't have, you know, \$250,000 in a separate account and then the downtown revitalization in this account. I think we have to put enough money in there to fund it properly. And then the criteria could be one or two large projects and each Legislative district would have at least one or two smaller projects that are worthy and that have passed all the criteria. So I don't think it was •• I don't think it was bad politics, I don't think it was a political, you know, game, to throw money, you know, just down the drain or anything like that, because from what I've seen, and not just in my district, every Legislator has had these projects going, and they're good projects, and they do contribute to the revitalization of downtown areas that got stomped on and got hurt by the large malls.

I think we have to, you know, like, show some respect to the people that are sitting all over the County and try to get a little bit of money there. I would take and just put both of the ideas together, put enough money in there to do it properly, and that's the way I'd like to see it go. But you know, I don't think there was ever a point where the committee was pressured to do one project on a political basis. I think they've evaluated them, and they've talked about them, and they've come up with some darn good projects all along. I don't think there was, that I could think of or that I've seen, not one politically motivated type of project. It's always been the merit system.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Well, to answer that, I agree with much of what you said, Cameron. And this is the fifth round for the program, and I wasn't around for the four previous rounds, and I do agree, there have been plenty of very good projects that have come out of it. It was, and if you check the minutes you can see this, it's said over and over again, of the advisory panel meetings, it was the panel members who wanted to change the direction.

And one of the things that was mentioned is that there were so many small projects with the understanding that they were divided not 18 ways, but sometimes, you know, five times 18 ways, that there was so many small ones. I always felt, as I sat in on the meetings, I don't

have a vote, but as I sat in on the meetings, that it could very well likely be that there could be 18 different projects. It really depends obviously on what kind of projects we get in. And the thing that I found most encouraging was that there were many panel members who have been there since the beginning who really do want to change, they want to change the process, and they got excited about this if it were possible.

There were some projects that weren't so great that were funded. In fact, you probably know we just had to go after one and try to recapture it. I'm talking about the trolley that was given to the Huntington Chamber, whatever its name was.

LEG. ALDEN:

That was a good project if they had done what they were supposed to do with the money.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I don't want to get •• we can talk about the details of that project. And the difference is now that if you take a look at the application, there are set criteria. What 1714 would do, maybe you would say, well, you can still use the application, but every project would have to be introduced by a Legislator, which would effectively give Legislators vetoes over projects. The fact of the matter is after the panel makes its recommendations, you can accept them or reject them. So there would be still that the Legislature would still be finally the ones who approved them.

LEG. ALDEN:

And actually, you know, you hit it right on the head. This was a creature of the Legislature. So 1714, actually, brings it back more to that flavor than, you know, just us giving up •• and not really giving up power, but you know, more or less telling the panel that they're going to be the ones that are going to be responsible for, like, all the decisions on it. So it kind of brings it back a little bit more to the, you know, like, what I said before, like, the flavor or, you know, like, the original intent of the Legislature when we created this downtown revitalization.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Okay. And the Chairwoman asked me to be succinct, so I don't want to belabor this. But I just urge you to read the minutes of the panel meetings.

LEG. ALDEN:

Oh, no. I have.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I just have one more, a new resolution.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I'm sorry, do you have a question?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Question, comment. Jim, thank you for coming here this morning. I want to go back to ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Thank you for thanking me for coming.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

•• the first subject, dealing with Gabreski Airport ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

•• and the advisory committee. I imagine you share my belief that having information is a good thing before making decisions and having citizen input at the airport is an important concept, and I know that the County Executive has recently, by Executive Order, created a Citizens Committee to help advise him. This Legislature is a separate body of government, and we are seeking and have been seeking to create a committee to advise us, and that was vetoed last year. A resolution was then put in by the County Executive to abolish the Lease Screening Committee, which failed.

In an effort to compromise, I said •• I put forth a resolution saying that I would agree to abolish the Lease Screening Committee if this Legislature could have an advisory committee. And a true citizens advisory committee, stakeholder committee, which you seems to still be opposed to, I don't see any middle ground or any compromise. You're putting forth your support for a resolution that takes a Lease Screening Committee and turns it into an advisory

committee. And as I said on the record before, three-quarters of that committee are not stakeholders. By far, the majority of the committee are not affected by what happens, they're only peripherally affected by what happens at that airport. I haven't seen an alternative put forward by the administration, and I think it's really not fair for the County Executive to block the Legislature from creating a committee to advise the Legislature. The County Executive has his committee to advise him, and I would just ask for some open mindedness and not stand in the way of this Legislature getting the information it needs to make proper decisions.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

My point on 1360 was it is, in effect, the old Lease Screening Committee, but it becomes advisory. 1722 has that function, advising on whether to approve or disapprove leases, but it also has a broader function. That's why I thought having the pilots and the leaseholders, and the FBO operators, the fixed-base operators, on the committee was a good idea for the quality of life at the airport. And we talked the last time, you remember, about all aspects and talked about what that meant, but I didn't think it was a good idea. I don't think •• and I see obvious conflicts having those folks making recommendations about leases at the airport. So there are two very different functions. And in 1722, they are together. And 1360, it's one, and in the Executive Order, it's a different one.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

You know, I thought it was obvious that if somebody had a conflict of interest, they wouldn't participate in that discussion, yet there were other discussions that they could participate in. And when you're trying to have a committee on the airport, you want, as you said earlier, to have the stakeholders involved. And certainly there's something to be brought to the table by those people who use the airport, the pilots or the leaseholders, but they should •• I agree that a leaseholder should not be deciding whether a competitor should be able to get a lease, and that could be resolved.

But I'm looking for that from the administration, for some ways to fix it, rather than just throw out the baby with the bath water. And I'm not hearing that, I'm just hearing just a total dismissal of what I think is a good concept and in favor of a concept that doesn't work for the airport or for the community. So, maybe you can rethink it a little.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Just one more.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

And I'm here in support of Introductory Resolution 1838, which is pretty straightforward. It goes back to the Downtown Revitalization Committee, but round three. It is a grant to the Sayville Chamber of Commerce. It was for replacement trees. It was for trees for downtown Sayville that were thought were going to be lost, they didn't lose them. They were •• the trees remained, and the Sayville Chamber asked if they could use the funding to •• for refuse receptacles, electrical outlets, lighting and floral landscaping. The Revitalization Chairwoman of the Sayville Chamber is here, Kate Cameron, and she could give you more specifics. But when I was just sitting here talking about the previous resolutions, I was thinking, you know, this is a good example of the work of the panel. At one of our previous meetings, this request was brought to the panel. They considered it, discussed it, and they voted unanimously to recommend the use of the money for the items that I just mentioned. And I'm sure if you had any questions, I don't know if you do, that Ms. Cameron would be glad to answer them.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

This was for 15,000?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

And this was round three?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

And what did they receive before that?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

They •• the 15,775, Legislator Nowick, was for trees they thought they were going to lose.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

But the trees were taken down, but then replaced by DPW.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay. Legislator Carpenter?

LEG. CARPENTER:

I just want to mention something. Friday evening, I had occasion to be in Sayville, having dinner and was so totally impressed by the Margaritaville event that was staged there through, I assume, it was the Chamber of Commerce.

MS. CAMERON:

Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:

And had occasion to talk to some of the police officers that were there, commenting how there were no problems, it was a wonderful group. And it spanned all ages, from, you know, young families with their kids in strollers, kids, you know, who were maybe 12 years old, a group of friends sitting there with boxes of pizza and soda and older people, including a gentleman walking with a parrot head hat on, who I hadn't seen in years. It was just really a wonderful event. I would say there had to be, you know, conservatively guessing, about 1500 people, if not more. And this was just a great, great event. So they're really doing a great job in Sayville.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

One of the things I said to Donna Pericone, Legislator, is that Bay Shore is not the only community that's reinvented itself. One of the things I want to tell you about too about the panel, if I may, because I think you should know this, is they're not just talking about the

grants, they've become •• they want to be a think tank now. The last meeting we talked about downtown parking. We're going to do a study on codes that limit or ban big block stores opening up on highways. And one of the things about Sayville is that like so many of our downtowns, it's not sewerred. And the fact we don't have sewers down there really limits what can be done in Sayville. But those are, you know, far afield of replacing trees.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I think one of the fortunate things with this Legislature is that we all •• we do care about our downtowns. And I think we work very hard to keep the downtowns active, and putting money into the downtowns could only be a boom economically. And I think we all do that. Absolutely, Sayville is one of the towns, and we have our Nursing Program now there from the College, which is wonderful. And that also spans into other towns. And Legislator Carpenter mentioned the Margaritaville, we in Smithtown have a program that is incredible. Our concerts in Smithtown have brought in hundreds, 15, 16, 1700 people. And every one of them is sitting on that lawn going to Dunkin Doughnuts or buying •• going into their downtown and buying. And this Legislature makes that possible. And it looks like Legislator Alden is just chomping at the bit.

LEG. ALDEN:

No. Legislator Carpenter mentioned, you know, it was a great Jimmy Buffet•like concert, yeah, well, what happened with the rain at the end? If it was so great, why not keep the water off of us?

LEG. CARPENTER:

It didn't rain.

LEG. ALDEN:

It poured. Next time you want to do a better job, keep the rain off, all right?

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Morgo.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

We are going to go to the agenda unless anybody here has anything to talk to us about. So we will start with tabled resolutions. 1360. And before I continue, Legislator Cooper does have an excused absence today.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

1360, a Local Law No •• 2005, a Charter Law to streamline County government by abolishing the Airport Lease Screening Committee (COUNTY EXEC)

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table subject to call.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to table subject to call, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? 1360 is **tabled subject to call. (VOTE:4•1•0•1 • Opposed: Legis. Foley • Not present: Legis. Cooper)**

1417, to evaluate the feasibility of establishing a renewable energy park on County property (COOPER). I think we still have some questions on that. I'm going to take make a motion to table.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Seconded by Legislator •• who said the second?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I did.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

All in favor? Opposed? 1417 is **tabled. (VOTE:4•1•0•1, opposed; Legis. Foley • Not present; Legis Cooper).**

1444, adopting Local Law No •• 2005, a Local Law adopting Labor Law Compliance Policy for the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency (COUNTY EXEC). We still have not gotten a go•ahead from Counsel, and Bond Counsel has a problem with that, so we are going to table that. Motion by myself, seconded by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? 1444 is **tabled. (VOTE:4•1•0•1, opposed; Legis. Foley • Not present; Legis Cooper).**

1714, to renew, reauthorize, revise and revamp the Suffolk County Downtown Revitalization Program (MONTANO). I think the sponsor •• one of the cosponsors, has some changes, is that true.

LEG. ALDEN:

No. No, I'm happy with this thing.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I thought there were some questions on it that I remember.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Table it one cycle.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

All right. So motion to table by Legislator Schneiderman one cycle, seconded by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. ALDEN:

Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Opposed, Legislator Alden. Motion to table has been approved. **TABLED (VOTE:3•2•0•1, opposed; Legis. Foley and Alden • Not present; Legis Cooper).**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

**1838, approving the change to Project for Downtown Revitalization Round III funding for the Greater Sayville Chamber of Commerce.
(COUNTY EXEC).**

I'm sorry. Greater Sayville Chamber of Commerce. Somehow I thought I remember some questions about that. There was a large amount of money deposited in Sayville, and we just did talk about that. You know what? I'm going to table that for one cycle. Do I have a second?

LEG. ALDEN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? 1838 is **tabled. (VOTE:5•0•0•1; Not present: Legis. Cooper)**

1839, accepting and appropriating an amendment to the College Budget for a grant award from the New York State Education Department through Rochester Institute of Technology for a pre•service and regional in•service interpreter training site 100% reimbursed by state funds at Suffolk County Community College (COUNTY EXEC).

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion to approve and put on the Consent Calender.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to approve and put on the Consent Calender by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor?
Opposed?

MS. JULIUS:

Second?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I second.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I have a second by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. ALDEN:

I thought I seconded it.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I have •• okay. **APPROVED** and placed on the **Consent Calender (VOTE:5•0•0•1; Not present: Legis. Cooper)**. You can do the next one.

1840, accepting and appropriating an amendment to the College Budget for a grant award from the State University of New York for an Educational Opportunity Program 84% reimbursed by state funds at Suffolk County Community College COUNTY EXEC).

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion by Legislator Carpenter, seconded by Legislator Alden. All in favor?

LEG. ALDEN:

Motion to put it on the Consent Calender.

LEG. CARPENTER:

You can't with 80%.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

All those in favor? Opposed? 1840 is **approved. (VOTE:5•0•0•1; Not present: Legis. Cooper)**.

1843, accepting and appropriating an amendment to the College Budget for a grant award from the State University of New York for a Bridge. Program 2005, 100% reimbursed by federal funds at Suffolk County Community

College (COUNTY EXEC). I think this can go on the Consent Calender.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to approve by Legislator Carpenter, seconded by Legislator Alden. All those in favor? Opposed? 1843 is **approved. (VOTE:5•0•0•1; Not present: Legis. Cooper).**

SENSE RESOLUTIONS

S.58, Sense of the Legislature Resolution in opposition to the re•licensing of Indian Point 2 and Indian Point 3 (VILORIA•FISHER).

Can we have an explanation on that?

MS. KNAPP:

As you know, the Indian Point Plants are •• are I'm going to say Upstate, but they're basically in lower New York State. And the relicensing •• their current licenses expire in 2013 and 2015 respectively, two and three.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

2013.

MS. KNAPP:

And 2015. But the relicensing takes a period of years.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Does it take ten years or eight years?

MS. KNAPP:

They probably started the process. The coalition has already formed in opposition to it.

LEG. ALDEN:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Indian Point 2 and Indian Point 3, where are they?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thirty miles outside of New York City.

LEG. NOWICK:

Joe, what county is Indian Point in?

LEG. ALDEN:

These are Upstate, right?

MR. SCHROEDER:

Yeah, it's in New York State, right.

LEG. ALDEN:

These are situated on a fault line, aren't they?

MR. SCHROEDER:

I can't speak to that directly.

LEG. ALDEN:

Yes, that's the answer to it. They built these on a fault. There's a fault line that runs right •• • you know, like, either through this one plant or ••

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think it was faulty thinking, actually, that built this thing.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

So do I have a motion?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve.

LEG. ALDEN:

You want to approve it?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

You want to table it?

LEG. ALDEN:

We do have a little time.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm opposed to all these nuclear power plants, they're old technology and they're dangerous.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion by Legislator Alden to table, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, I'm not going to second the tabling motion on this.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Second by myself. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Opposed?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Opposed to tabling.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

That's fine. **TABLED (VOTE:4 • 1 • 0 • 1, opposed; Legis. Schneiderman • Not present; Legis Cooper).**

S.59, Sense of the Legislature Resolution in support of the rebuilding and/or repowering of the outdated Northport Power Plant (COOPER).

Same motion, same second, until we find out a little more about that one. **TABLED (VOTE:4 • 1 • 0 • 1, opposed; Legis. Schneiderman • Not present; Legis Cooper).**

TABLED SENSE RESOLUTIONS

S.43, Sense of the Legislature Resolution in support of the LIPA offshore wind energy park (COOPER).

LEG. ALDEN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to table by Legislator Alden, seconded by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? S.43 has been **tabled (VOTE:5 • 0 • 0 • 1; Not present: Legis. Cooper).**

That would conclude the agenda for today, and I believe we have to go into Executive Session. Is there a County Attorney here present? Somebody from the County Attorney's Office here present? Okay. We're going to go into Executive Session, which means •• oh, here's somebody from the County Attorney's Office just walked in. Everybody will have to leave. We're going to bring in attorneys, one group at a time. The aides, Legislative aides can certainly stay here.

LEG. ALDEN:

Budget Review you might want to stay.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Budget Review, crunch the numbers here.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I make a motion and second to go into Executive Session. Has that been done?

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Not yet. Okay. I'm going to make a motion to go into Executive Session, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

For the purposes of discussing Counsel for the Broadwater.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

For the purpose of discussing Counsel for Broadwater.

LEG. ALDEN:

Personally, I don't care if Ben wants to stay.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Excuse me?

LEG. ALDEN:

I don't care if Ben wants to stay.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Mr. Zwirn, if you want •• if you want to stay, you can. Can we make sure the speakers are all off and the speakers outside are all off.

[EXECUTIVE SESSION WAS HELD FROM 9:43 A.M. TO 11:59 P.M.]

LEG. ALDEN:

We are back on the record. Motion to reconsider the calendar for the purpose of allowing Legislator Foley to record his vote.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second.

LEG. FOLEY:

Madam Chair, on the tabled resolutions, just list me in opposition to the tabling. Four resolutions •• Introductory Resolutions 1838 •• was that tabled? 1838 was tabled. Opposed to tabling 1838, but also •• but list me with the majority on 1839, 1840, 43. S•58, S•59, what happened with S•43? Was that tabled again? Majority on •• on all Sense resolutions, majority on 1839, 40 and 43 and opposed to the tabling for the prior four resolutions. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Legislator SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to adjourn by myself, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed?
Meeting adjourned.

(* THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 12:00 P.M. *)

_ _ DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY